DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 945 EC 005 147

TITLE	Twin City Institute for Talented Youth. Annual Report.
INSTITUTION	Twin City Inst. for Talented Youth, St. Paul, Minn.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS	Activities, *Admission Criteria, Courses, Curriculum, Disadvantaged Youth, *Exceptional Child Research, *Gifted, Master Teachers, Program Evaluation, Public School Teachers, *Summer Programs, *Talented Students

ABSTRACT

A summer program enrolled 579 talented students. Regular admit students had higher aptitude test scores and grade point averages; special admit students, who came from inner city schools, manifested creative and artistic abilities and high motivation. Courses were offered in the arts, the humanities, foreign language, language arts, math and science, and social and behavioral science. Students also participated in seminars and special events. Associate teachers from the city schools worked with master teachers. Special admit students did relatively well; students as a whole were positive about the program; associate teachers were favorable, but wanted more contact with students and planning time with master teachers. Administrative evaluation suggested orientation for students regarding norms, questioned locating the program on a college campus, and approved the modified admission policy and the problem emphasis in the curriculum. (JD)

ED036945

TWIN CITY INSTITUTE

FOR TALENTED YOUTH

ANNUAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June 16 - July 25, 1969 Macalester College

EC005715

The Twin City Institute for Talented Youth is an independent, non-profit organization that has been made possible by support from the Minneapolis and Saint Paul Public Schools, Title III grants, and contributions from foundations, corporations, and individuals of the Twin Cities.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Director, Twin City Institute for Talented Youth, 400 12th Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414. (373-7929 Area Code 612)

Foreward

The successes of the Twin City Institute have come from a variety of interests and efforts. Appreciation must be given to the teaching staff, whose creative labors helped to generate and sustain student interest and enthusiasm; to the 579 students who challenged our imagination and resources with insatiable energies and talents; to the generous donors of the Twin Cities and the Federal Government who helped provide the necessary financial support; to the State Department of Education whose consul was always available; and to the Institute's Board of Directors for their generous time and interest in the boys and girls of the two cities. Through the efforts of the Institute Board, a new important program of education has been introduced into the Twin Cities.

At its inception in 1967, the primary objective of the Twin City Institute for Talented Youth was to create an educational program that would have appeal for the academically talented youth of Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Specifically, the Institute would:

1. Offer more advanced courses not usually found in the high school curriculum
2. Employ experienced and highly competent master teachers
3. Provide a learning atmosphere that would stimulate thought, inquiry, and creativity
4. Offer every student an opportunity to enroll in one course that would be studied in-depth for four hours
5. Enroll students on the basis of their individual merit from the public, private, and parochial schools in the Twin Cities
6. Encourage and develop better teaching techniques which could be emulated by schools during the regular school year

6. Encourage and develop better teaching techniques which could be emulated by schools during the regular school year
7. Help train teachers from the public secondary schools by assigning less experienced teachers to the master teaching staff
8. Provide a pleasurable, useful activity for talented students during the summer months

Implicit in these objectives was the need to create a learning environment that would generate more student interest and involvement. That involvement meant that a curriculum had to be developed that was relevant to the lives of boys and girls. It would have to remain flexible, and, of course, be willing to assume the risks that are an inescapable part of innovation. This meant that while it would respect the traditions that are an essential part of any new institution it would not be restricted by that tradition but rather experiment with new curriculum designs and methodologies in an open atmosphere of freedom.

What follows then is an abridged description of those efforts. While we are obviously excited about celebrating and broadcasting our successes, we are judicious and objective enough to note our failures. We trust that more experience in future Institutes will reinforce the former and pale the latter.

Student Recruitment and Selection

Recruiting and selecting students is still one of the most exciting and difficult problems of the Institute. In 1967, the first year of the Institute, the criteria for selection was based largely upon an 80 percent threshold score on the Differential Aptitude Test, grade-point

average, and the school's recommendation. While the required score on the D.A.T. helped to guarantee the admission of academically talented students, it too often eliminated those students who were poor readers, had other kinds of talent, or who came from disadvantaged backgrounds. In short, the test was especially discriminating against children who generally demonstrated strong motivation but whose D.A.T. or I.Q. scores did not meet the regular admission requirements. By lowering the requirements, we were obviously in a better position to encourage students from target or inner-city schools. At the same time we were more broadly interpreting the term "talented" to include music, artistic, leadership, or interpretive aptitudes. Professor Torrence, one of the country's leading authorities on gifted children, has suggested a set of creative positives that "occur to a high degree among disadvantaged children."[1] They include: 1. High non verbal fluency and originality; 2. High creative productivity in small groups; 3. Adept in visual art activities; 4. Highly creative in movement, dance, and other physical activities; 5. Highly motivated by games, sports, humor, and concrete objects; 6. Language rich in imagery.

There was still a third reason why we chose to modify the admission criteria for some students. We were curious to discover if those students with low test scores but high motivation were admitted, would teachers detect any significant differences between these "Special Admit" students and those who were admitted by the more rigid criteria of the D.A.T. We thought it would be desirable to do at least a

---

[1] E. Paul Torrence, "Creative Positives of Disadvantageous Children and Youth," Gifted Child Quarterly, Vol. XIII, No. 2, Summer, 1969, 74-75

limited study to determine: (1) whether the Special Admit students could realize a modicum of success; (2) whether they would have a high drop out rate, and; (3) whether teachers would detect any significant difference in their performance.

While at this writing our study has not been finalized, a modest interpretation of the evidence suggests that Special Admit students did less well than Regular Admit students on the first testing of the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Test, but narrowed the gap somewhat by the second test administration. The Regular Admit students' scores went down slightly over the five weeks of the Institute, but the Special Admit students' scores increased slightly. There was some evidence, however, that on the second test Regular Admit students did not take the task as seriously as did the Special Admit students. Regarding self-esteem, there was little difference between the Regular Admit and Special Admit students. Special Admit students did, however, exhibit slightly greater self-esteem, on the average, than did Regular Admit students.

I should add that at the outset, the Special Admit students had D.A.T. scores more than 30 points lower (on the average) than Regular Admit students (57.6 versus 88.8), and Grade Point Averages of 2.8 versus 3.5 for Regular Admit students. Thus, on the measures taken by our research team, the Special Admit students appear to have done relatively well so far.[1]

---

[1] This study is being done in collaboration with Dr. David Feldman, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Minnesota.

Furthermore, it appears that students who were admitted from inner-city schools with lower test scores and placed in classes where originality, artistic, and physical activities were an integral part of the course[1] not only survived, but made significant contributions to the success of the class, which would generally support the finding of Dr. Torrance. (See above.) On the other hand, when some of these students were placed in classes of their first choice such as Computer, Rise of Modern Physics, or Astro-Science, their limited background and perhaps lower aptitude resulted in frustration and disappointment and occasional transfer, poor attendance, and even drop out. But our studies are still incomplete, or at best in their incipient stage. In future years it would be advisable to continue this kind of research to determine what kind of student most benefits from the Institute.

In 1969 the Institute attracted more students from target areas (see appendix) and more non-white students than in 1967 or 1968.[2] But the number is still too low, and greater effort continues to be made to gain a better racial balance. The total number of all students applying reached a new high of 954, a rather significant indication that interest continues to grow in a program that is attempting to create some new dimensions in secondary education. There was also a substantial increase in the actual number of students attending (see appendix.) In 1967 the students numbered 330; in 1968, 432; and in 1969, 579. Thus, we are ahead of the original enrollment plans, which were to

---

[1] Such classes as: Theatre, Monumental Art, Art of the Film, Afro-American Studies, Humanities, Psychology of Human Relations, and Protest, Resistance and Revolution.

[2] In 1967, 5 non-white; in 1968, 15; and in 1969, 40 non-whites attended.

include 500 by 1969. While teacher-student ratios have increased slightly, only two teachers in this year's Institute thought that class size limited the success of their class.[1]

The distribution between the two cities and between public and parochial schools remains quite constant (see appendix) with each city getting its fair proportion of attendees. Students continue to express strong interest in returning to the Institute in succeeding summers. When those eligible were asked if they would like to return in 1970, over ninety-five percent stated that they would like to re-apply either in the subject area in which they were currently enrolled or in a new subject area. And, interestingly enough, even when they were dissatisfied with their particular course, rather than generalize their dissatisfaction to the entire Institute, they still expressed commitment and enjoyment of the total program. Later in this report student reactions will be discussed.

Curriculum for 1969

I.	The Arts	-Art of the Film
		-Monumental Environmental Workshop
		-Society and Music
		-Theatre Workshop
II.	The Humanities	-Humanities (Values in Transition)
III.	Foreign Language	-Russian I and II
IV.	Language Arts	-Modern Rhetoric
		-Poetry Workshop

---

[1] The average class ratio in 1967 was approximately 19; in 1968, 22; and in 1969, 26.

V.	Math and Science	-Astro-Science
		-Computer Mathematics
		-Computer Applications in Probability and Statistics
		-Ecological Biology
		-Man-Made World
		-The Rise of Modern Physics
VI.	Social and Behavioral Science	-Afro-American Studies
		-Anthropology
		-Economics
		-Protest, Resistance and Revolution: The Causes and Effects of Revolutionary Social Change
		-Psychology of Human Relations
		-Revolution or Evolution - The Third World of Underdeveloped Nations
		-Slums and Suburbs - The Urban Conflict
		-Modern Industrial Processes

There are at least two ways of determining what should be offered in a curriculum that purports to be innovative and experimental.

1. Survey students to determine their needs and interests.
2. Consult teachers and curriculum and subject matter specialists.

The Institute has attempted to combine both student and professional responses in a program that has in part achieved one of its primary interests - offering a program of study that is different from the regular school curriculum. Unfortunately, even this kind of planning is not always successful.

Consultants in the social sciences suggested that courses in the New Economics and Social Change in Underdeveloped Countries would be exciting to students, and we assumed that the course "Modern Industrial Processes" would attract students who were interested in engineering, drafting, industrial development or entrepreneurial skills. However, all three courses failed to attract any significant interest. Similarly, the course "Man Made World", an interdisciplinary study of the physical sciences met the same fate. Consequently, all four courses were cancelled. (See appendix)

On the other hand, new courses such as Astro-science, Humanities, and Protest, Resistance and Revolution (see appendix) were so popular that additional sections were added. Many of the courses that were offered in 1968 had enough student interst to justify sustaining them in the total curriculum, and some subjects, such as Afro-American Studies, Theatre, Computer Math, Psychology, and Russian attracted more interest than they had in years past.

Daily Schedule and Routine

Classes began at 8:15 and dismissed at 12:15. A four-hour block of time provides students with the opportunity to "post hole" a subject in considerable detail just as it encourages teachers to plan extended field trips and make more effective use of large and small group activities.

At one o'clock in the afternoon a series of daily seminars was scheduled. Students had the opportunity to become familiar with the variety of subjects that represented most of the disciplines taught in the Institute. Responses to these seminars was uneven, with audiences varying from thirty to two hundred students. Because many students work

or have family commitments, it is probably undesirable to schedule a longer school day. Nonetheless, many students were reluctant to leave the campus and enjoyed either working on their own class projects or attending seminars.

Special Events

Because the six weeks Institute involves such a concentrated period of study, teachers and students are usually interested in programs that support or complement their own classes. This year we were unusually fortunate in being able to offer a series of events that not only added variety and interest to the total program but were highly relevant to many of the classes. Mr. William Rogers of the University of Minnesota World Affairs Center made available to the Institute Department of State representatives. These "Diplomats in Residence" represented Japan, Europe, Brazil, Africa, and a press officer from the Bureau of Public Affairs. In addition, Macalester College sponsored a series of evening programs entitled "Can Urban Man Survive?", a theme that has always been relevant to the Institute.

Macalester also made available all of its recreational facilities and invited our students to its social activities. Thus, after class, the pool and gymnasium were used and Fridays our students could attend the college dances.

Social critics have referred to the last few years as the "decade of protest." Few schools have escaped the problem of confrontation; and the Institute is no exception. Several of the classes had been studying the meaning of social change including the strategies of change, and from these classes came the request that there should be an assembly

where students could express their attitudes about education. After hearing that our own Board was to convene on campus, students requested that a meeting be arranged where ideas could be exchanged and valuable opinions expressed between Board members and students of the Institute. The Board was anxious and interested in such a meeting. Consequently, it was scheduled in the afternoon and attended by over 150 students, members of the Minneapolis and Saint Paul Boards of Education, and Directors from the Twin City Institute. Time does not permit any detailed discussion of that "happening," except to say that students and Board members alike listened to each other and left the meeting, undoubtedly with heightened anxiety and frustration concerning the difficulty of seeking any institutional change, but with more understanding and appreciation of the myriad questions and problems confronting both students and governing Boards. Out of this meeting came at least a suggestion of a model that schools might begin to consider as they encourage open dialogue with student groups.

During the final week various classes held open houses: The Theatre and Afro-American Studies groups presented plays; the Art of the Film class presented films that had been student produced; the Slums and Suburbs class presented a series of vignettes that were individualized interpretations of social problems; the Astro-science class fired rockets; the Society and Music class gave a series of recitals; and the Monumental Environmental Art class demonstrated their "wild spatial experience." While students were not able to visit all of the classes, most of them gained a representative interpretation of the work and fun that had been going on in the six weeks and developed more identification with the total institute.

The Institute and Teacher Education

The associate teachers, who are career teachers committed to the city systems, have become an integral part of the instructional team. By working with a master teacher in the environment of the Institute, he improves not only his understanding of his discipline but also internalizes some of the more sophisticated instructional skills that are occurring in his class. It is part of his responsibility to feed back into his own city system the best and most relevant experiences of his class.

This unique feature of the Institute had a different beginning. In fact, in 1967 there were barely enough applicants to fill the eighteen teaching positions. In 1968 there were almost three applicants for each position, and a better selection could be made. This year, over ninety applications were received for the twenty-two teaching posts. They proved to be a highly select, energetic and bright group of teachers whose contributions to the total work of the class was affirmed by all master teachers and students. Some of them had such interesting academic backgrounds that many master teachers relied upon them as a valuable resource and were grateful for their participation in class dialogues and leadership in small group discussions.

Student Evaluation

Student interest and commitment to the Institute continues to grow; in 1967 there were approximately 800 applicants; this year over 950.

While there is no single factor that motivates students to apply for our program, the questionnaires given each year serve as an accurate index of student attitude.

Undoubtedly, the status of attending the summer program, parental and peer influence, and, most important, positive feed-back from students who participated in past Institutes are important, but whatever the reason, students who do attend come with rather specific expectations that become more explicit as the summer progresses. One could summarize them as follows:[1]

> "I want to get away from ordinary high school and get a better preparation for college."
>
> "I want to study in an open atmosphere free from the petty restrictions of my school."
>
> "I want to have closer relations with teachers who are open-minded and respect me as a learner."
>
> "I want to meet other people who are interested in ideas and have initiative to learn, and I want to be challenged and discover new ideas."

These are samples of their expectations before actual classes began; the hopes that boys and girls bring to the Institute.

How does the Institute succeed or fail in meeting these desires? Without attempting any categorical quantifications and simultaneously trying to avoid hyperbole, our conclusion, once again based upon close evaluation of the student questionnaires, suggests that <u>the majority of students found that the Institute fulfilled their prior hopes</u>. Abstracting again:

> "It was exciting, inspirational...great! This outburst of adjectives is because TCITY is different from the run-of-the-mill school year."

---

[1] These actual responses are only representative and could be duplicated from past questionnaires hundreds of times.

"I am really glad that the Institute class turned out the way it did, however I did not realize that I was so sick of school. Now I feel that I can go back and take another year."

"All in all, it was the best experience of my life."

While a great majority (approximately 85%) were positive about their class experience, some were disappointed. Their responses should serve as a mandate to examine the question why we are failing in our teaching. I suspect the students who found their classroom experience disappointing in the Institute are simply mirroring the same disappointments that take place during the regular school year. Most of all, they disliked being talked to constantly. "It was very boring to me - there was too much lecture" is probably the most repeated indictment from those students who were disappointed with their class. The second point of dissatisfaction is that the "teacher didn't care enough about me as a person - his teaching methods did not vary from those at public school." Once again the reiteration - students in all schools desire classrooms that are characterized by openness and trust, where both teachers and students are openly sensitive and supportive of each other and not closed off by anxiety, threat, custom, or role.

Finally, it was interesting to note that even when students were disappointed with the subject matter or various forms of negative constraint imposed by what they interpreted as undesirable teaching methodology, they still found the total Institute rewarding.

"Other teachers in different classes affected me more than my teacher. Sorry to make the criticism, but its just that the Institute is so wonderful."

While they were critical of their specific class, they appreciated the total invironment. The charge to the Institute seems obvious - it is the same charge that is valid for the secondary school: Be sensitive to the needs of boys and girls and modify your techniques, re-examine learning theory, learn to identify with the learner.

Teacher Evaluation

In planning for the 1969 staff of the Institute, the intention was to retain the most outstanding teachers from the 1968 program. Thus, of the twenty-two master teachers contracted for 1969, eleven had prior experience teaching in the Institute. All of the associate teachers were new to the program and were under contract to Minneapolis and Saint Paul. Each teacher came with the highest credentials and in the case of the master teachers had established outstanding reputations as leaders in their field. A majority taught in the Institute because it "gave me the opportunity to try out new methods of teaching," and to "see what value the program would have for children." Like the students, most of them were pleased and enthusiastic about their experience. After the Institute was over, all the teachers were asked to respond to this experience noting both their successes and disappointments. The representative responses reflect that the freedom given to the staff was one of the key satisfactions.

> "I appreciated the freedom I have been given to deal with content, ideas, and people without the obstacles of grades, forms, or paper."
>
> "I enjoyed the opportunity of teaching with truly outstanding colleagues and a well chosen student body in an atmosphere of academic freedom."
>
> "I enjoyed the free atmosphere of the Institute and the open communication between student and teacher. It was a pleasure not having motivation as a problem."

But two problems did emerge that disturbed several teachers. First was the need to establish still closer communication between teachers and students. Because the Institute was held on a college campus and many classes were separated, lack of communication did sometimes present a problem that affected the unity of the Institute and in some cases caused an undesirable isolation that made interaction difficult. Moreover, because the Institute has grown to almost six hundred students, the midmorning break had to be staggered; consequently, there wasn't as much informal socializing at this period of the day than had taken place in past years.

The other problem raised by some associate teachers was the need for more meetings to be held between master and associate teachers prior to the opening of the Institute. Since there were no meetings specifically scheduled for master and associate teacher planning, some associate teachers never received adequate information concerning the direction, course content and methodologies that would be utilized prior to the first week of school. Initially, some felt handicapped that they could not immediately assume an effective role. Next year time will be allocated for team planning prior to the opening of the Institute.

Administrative Evaluation and Recommendation

A. Site

For the past two years the sites of the Institute have been Murray High School, Saint Paul, and Marshall High School, Minneapolis. This year the Institute was invited to Macalester College. The college offered the advantages of superior facilities including air-conditioned classrooms, modern laboratories, a Computer Center, an unsurpassed studio theatre and

an excellent library. Moreover, it added to the dignity of the Institute and gave students an opportunity to familiarize themselves with life on a college campus. The Board and staff were interested to determine what effect moving to a college location would have upon the total program. The Macalester administration and faculty could not have been more hospitable and cooperative. Preparing a campus for six hundred high school students is no easy task, but thanks to the efforts of Dean Murray Braden and Dean Kenneth Goodrich, the "occupation" was smoothly effected.

Both staff and students overwhelmingly preferred the college campus to the high school. The openness of the campus, the diverse resources, and the sheer beauty of the grounds and buildings made it an inviting and compelling place in which to learn. But in spite of their enthusiasm for this location, several problems emerged.

While we gained in the quality of the facilities and general physical environment, we lost some of the close unity that had been experienced. If the Institute continues to use college campuses, more attention will have to be directed to the problem of how to create a more unified academic community. Students and faculty need to interact. Indeed, this is one of the key reasons why the Institute has been able to assume such a viable institutional identity.

The other important question is by having the Institute on a college campus, are we perhaps tacitly admitting that quality education cannot take place in a high school? Both of these questions will have to be given greater consideration.

B. Student Selection

In the last annual report attention was called for the need to reconsider the rather restricted selection criteria that has governed past selection policies. The 80% threshold score of the Differential Aptitude Test denied admission to many students who had various kinds of talents that frequently are not revealed by test scores. Thus far it appears that those students who were admitted as "risk" or "special admit" had a very low rate of drop out and were able to succeed in most of the classes to which they were assigned.

We, therefore, see the need to continue the modification of our admission policy and likewise, continue to research the effects that such a policy has upon the success of students who might otherwise be denied admission. As far as we can determine, this policy has in no way altered the primary intentions of the Institute.

Because the Institute has tried to promote a more open kind of education, and extend more freedom to students than regular schools, policies of deportment or behavior have to be considered. While the Institute has not been faced with such problems as the dress code or grading, there is no question that greater freedom and informality result in some behavioral changes that occasionally disturb some teachers and visitors. The purpose of altering old patterns is, of course, to modify more authoritarian structures and make dialogue and trust more open, and identification between the student and his school more authentic, but some teachers, and even students, accustomed to more rigid behavior prescriptions are occasionally threatened. Teachers may feel that their respect is being undermined or that students don't respect their role. Some students, on the other hand, used to more passive

roles in the classroom, have not learned to function responsibly or autonomously and have difficulty adjusting to various social and academic scenes where codes are apt to be ambiguous. Some of these attitudes are ultimately translated as critical thinking skills and are learned as the young scholar matures, but others might more directly be learned in an orientation period that is seldom attempted in the secondary school. It is therefore recommended that the 1970 Institute set aside a period of time apart from the precious instructional period to bring staff and students together to discuss what rules or norms should govern the Institute. This kind of orientation could alleviate some of the anxieties or questions that teachers and students have as they begin their summer study.

C. Curriculum

Those courses that related more closely to the life of the students were undoubtedly the most successful. That relationship, however, does not connote that these courses had only a personal or social emphasis, rather it suggests that a problem emphasis, whether it be in a political, social, communicative, religious, scientific, or aesthetic context results in higher levels of identification and motivation.

This kind of problem relevancy or emphasis is an essential concomitant of open education; it does not discount the importance of mastering the various skills of a given discipline. It is simply a reiterated plea that exclusive reliance upon the lecture or recitation method should be replaced or at least altered by more relevant methodologies. Thus teachers who varied their instructional modes and were willing to take advantage of field trips and the total environment of

the community, who utilized audio visual material, were skilled in small group instruction, and respected the desire of students to pursue individual problems were the teachers whose students were the most enthusiastic and committed to the intentions of the Institute.

Summary

It has been a pleasure for me to serve as director of the Twin City Institute for Talented Youth the past year. With modesty, I think we can all claim that the Institute has begun to establish itself as a clearly identifiable educational institution in the two cities. Most of the goals that were originally outlined in 1967 have been achieved. Enrollment has gone from 332 to 579 - the curriculum has continued to expand, and, most important of all, teachers and students alike have found the Institute an exciting and meaningful experience in education.

Charles A. Caruson, Director

Twin City Institute for Talented Youth

October, 1969

Appendix A

Course Popularity (First Choice)

Course	Number of First Choices	Final Class Size
Afro-American Studies	19	22
Anthropology	60	26
Art of the Film	21	26
**Astro-Science	76	55
Computer Applications in Probability and Statistics	28	26
Computer Mathematics	153	41
**Ecological Biology	91	49
+Economics	12	--
**Humanities - Values in Transition	78	51
+Man-Made World	2	--
+Modern Industrial Processes	1	--
Modern Rhetoric	18	23
Monumental Environmental Workshop	25	28
**Protest, Resistance and Revolution	59	49
Psychology of Human Relations	75	24
+Revolution or Evolution	5	--
Rise of Modern Physics	13	27
Russian	57	37
Slums and Suburbs	32	23
Society and Music	26	23
Theatre Workshop	81	28
Workshop in Contemporary Poetry	22	21
TOTALS:	954	579

** Course doubled

+ Course dropped

STUDENT STATISTICS

I. School

		Applied	Admitted	Attended
Minneapolis	Public Senior	256	207	162
	Public Junior	156	113	94
	Private	84	49	43
		496	369	299
Saint Paul	Public Senior	155	122	96
	Public Junior	136	95	77
	Private	161	114	101
		458	337	280
Other (Out of state students, Twin City residents)		6	6	6
	TOTALS:	954	706	579

II. Male-Female Ratio

	Applied	Attended
Male	371	242
Female	583	337
TOTALS:	954	579

III. Age Distribution

	Applied	Attended
13 years	5	4
14 years	298	157
15 years	352	201
16 years	233	173
17 years	64	43
18 years	1	1
19 years	1	0
TOTALS:	954	579

IV. Previous Attendees

	Applied	Attended
Yes - attended previously	143	105
No - did not attend	811	474
	954	579

Appendix C

School Distribution - 1969

Saint Paul

SCHOOL	NUMBER APPLIED	NUMBER ADMITTED	NUMBER ATTENDED	CANCELS AFTER 6/16	ADMITTED - UNABLE ATTEND
Central	19	19	15	0	4
Harding	30	20	12	0	8
Highland Park	8	6	4	0	2
Humboldt	4	3	1	1	1
Johnson	13	10	6	1	3
Mechanic Arts	8	8	6	0	2
Monroe	12	9	8	1	0
Murray	20	16	15	0	1
Washington	41	31	29	1	1
Technical Vocational	0	0	0	0	0
Cleveland Junior	29	19	13	0	6
Como Park Junior	14	9	8	1	0
Hazel Park Junior	11	7	7	0	0
Highland Park Junior	17	13	11	0	2
Marshall Junior	9	8	6	0	2
Mound Park Junior	26	15	12	0	3
Ramsey Junior	10	7	7	0	0
Roosevelt Junior	9	7	7	0	0
Wilson Junior	11	10	6	0	4
	291	217	173	5	39
Archbishop Murray	1	1	1	0	0
Brady	3	3	3	0	0
Concordia	0	0	0	0	0
Cretin	32	24	19	1	4
Derham Hall	10	6	5	0	1
Hill	6	4	4	0	0
Nazareth Hall	0	0	0	0	0
Our Lady of Peace	32	23	22	1	0
St. Agnes	11	9	8	1	0
St. Bernards	7	5	5	0	0
St. Croix Lutheran	0	0	0	0	0
St. Joseph's Academy	23	13	11	0	2
St. Paul Academy	2	2	2	0	0
St. Paul Lutheran	0	0	0	0	0
St. Thomas Academy	4	4	4	0	0
Summit School	21	16	14	0	2
Visitation Academy	9	4	3	1	0
Sterling School	2	2	2	0	0
Yeshiva High School	1	1	1	0	0
Miss Hall's School	1	1	1	0	0
St. Mary's Hall	1	1	1	0	0
St. John's, Collegeville	1	1	1	0	0
	167	120	107	4	9
SAINT PAUL TOTAL	458	337	280	9	48

Appendix D

School Distribution - 1969

Minneapolis

SCHOOL	NUMBER APPLIED	NUMBER ADMITTED	NUMBER ATTENDED	CANCELS AFTER 6/16	ADMITTED - UNABLE ATTEND
Central	19	14	12	1	1
Edison	18	15	14	0	1
Patrick Henry	8	6	4	0	2
Marshall-University	57	35	29	2	4
North	17	15	8	0	7
Roosevelt	24	22	21	1	0
South	8	8	4	0	4
Southwest	37	33	23	0	10
Vocational	7	7	6	1	0
Washburn	38	32	27	0	5
West	22	19	13	0	6
Work Opportunity Center	1	1	1	0	0
Anthony Junior	17	17	12	0	5
Bryant Junior	13	13	11	0	2
Folwell Junior	11	8	7	0	1
Franklin Junior	0	0	0	0	0
Jefferson Junior	21	13	9	0	4
Jordan Junior	13	9	9	0	0
Lincoln Junior	6	6	6	0	0
Nokomis Junior	5	4	4	0	0
Northeast Junior	15	10	9	0	1
Olson Junior	11	4	3	1	0
Phillips Junior	5	5	3	0	2
Ramsey Junior	17	13	12	0	1
Sanford Junior	13	8	6	0	2
Sheridan Junior	4	2	2	0	0
Southwest Junior	5	1	1	0	0
	412	320	256	6	58
Academy of Holy Angels	9	6	4	0	2
Benilde	6	5	5	0	0
Blake	4	3	3	0	0
Breck	1	1	1	0	0
De La Salle	12	9	8	0	1
Grace	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Junior Academy	0	0	0	0	0
Minneapolis Lutheran	0	0	0	0	0
Minnehaha Academy	7	3	3	0	0
Northrop Collegiate	8	5	4	0	1
Regina	28	14	12	0	2
St. Anthony of Padua	6	2	2	0	0
St. Margaret	3	1	1	0	0
	84	49	43	0	6
MINNEAPOLIS TOTAL	496	369	299	6	64

1969 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Howard Brin President	President, Brin Glass Company
Howard M. Guthmann Vice President	C.P.A., Wilkerson, Guthmann and Johnson
Mrs. Joyce A. Smith Secretary	Associate Attorney, Howard, Le Fevera, Lefler Hamilton and Pearson
Marvin Ellison Treasurer	Vice President, Northwestern National Bank, Saint Paul
Richard Allen	Director of Paper Procurement, Bemis Company
Donald Bridgman	Attorney
Mrs. Phyllis Cardozo	President, Parents for Integrated Education
Mrs. Dorothea Chelgren	Director, St. Paul Council for Human Relations
Mrs. Barbara Davis	Board member, Children's Health Center, League of Women Voters
Mrs. Jean Druker	President, St. Paul School Committee
George Edberg	Associate Superintendent, Saint Paul Public Schools, Secondary Education
Kyle Fossum	Senior Vice President, Federal Reserve Bank, Minneapolis
Malcolm McDonald	Vice President, First National Bank, St. Paul
Mrs. Charlotte Mitau	Vice Chairman, St. Paul Board of Education
Nathaniel Ober	Associate Superintendent, Minneapolis Public Schools, Secondary Education
Lawrence O'Shaughnessy	Vice President, Macromite, Inc.
Stuart Rider, Jr.	Attorney, Rider, Bennet, Egan, Johnson and Arundel
Stanley Rude	Publicity Director, Northwestern National Bank
Brother Theodore	Secondary Supervisor, St. Paul Archdiocese
John M. Warder	President, Plymouth National Bank
Mrs. Ester Wattenberg	Project Director, University New Careers University of Minnesota
[1]Mrs. Fran Naftalin	Board member, East Side Neighborhood Service
[2]Dr. Burnham Terrell	Director, Honors Division, University of Minnesota

1969 FACULTY

Name	Title	Course
Edwin Anderson, M.A.	Master Teacher	Computer Applications in Probability and Statistics
Hubert Anderson, M.A.	Master Teacher	Modern Rhetoric
Dorothy Blackstone, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Humanities
Lyle Bradley, M.A.	Master Teacher	Ecological Biology
John Caddy, B.A.	Master Teacher	Poetry Workshop
Joel Charon, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Protest, Resistance and Revolution
Harlan Christainson, B.A.	Master Teacher	Humanities
John E. Christensen, M.A.	Master Teacher	Protest, Resistance and Revolution
Daniel Conrad, M.A.	Master Teacher	Protest, Resistance and Revolution
Roger DeClercq, M.A.	Master Teacher	Theatre Workshop
John Edwards, M.A.	Master Teacher	Astro-science
Barbara Fraser, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Psychology of Human Relations
Daniel Fuller, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Ecological Biology
Peter Gambucci, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Astro-science
Roseann Genich, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Protest, Resistance and Revolution
Roger Girard, M.S.	Associate Teacher	Rise of Modern Physics
Constance Goetz, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Theatre Workshop
Douglas Hendrickson, M.F.A.	Master Teacher	Monumental Environmental Workshop
Sebestian Hernandez, M.Ed.	Associate Teacher	Slums and Suburbs
Phillip Jacobs, B.S.	Associate Teacher	Astro-science
Eunice Kanning, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Computer Mathematics
Sung Kyu Kim, Ph.D.	Master Teacher	Rise of Modern Physics
Norene Lindsay, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Art of the Film
Samuel Marks, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Society and Music

Name	Title	Course
Al Milgom, M.A.	Master Teacher	Art of the Film
William Miller, M.A.	Master Teacher	Humanities
James Olson, M.A.	Master Teacher	Cultural Anthropology
Anne Parkinson, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Cultural Anthropology
Carole Pressley, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Modern Rhetoric
James Phillips, Ph.D.	Master Teacher	Afro-American Studies
Johannes Reidel, Ph.D.	Master Teacher	Society and Music
Donald Ryberg, M.A.	Master Teacher	Russian
Carol Shingles, B.A.	Master Teacher	Computer Mathematics
Alice Smith, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Poetry Workshop
Max Sporer, B.S., B.A.	Associate Teacher	Humanities
Harold Strobel, M.A.	Master Teacher	Ecological Biology
Frank Taylor, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Ecological Biology
Charles Thiele, M.A.	Master Teacher	Astro-science
Albert Tschida, B.S.	Associate Teacher	Computer Mathematics
Floyd Vare, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Russian
Jerrold Wagner, M.A.	Master Teacher	Ecological Biology
Thomas Walz, Ph.D.	Master Teacher	Slums and Suburbs
Joel Watne, M.A.	Associate Teacher	Afro-American Studies
Maurice Weinblatt, B.A.	Associate Teacher	Monumental Environmental Workshop
Otto Wirgau, M.A.	Master Teacher	Psychology of Human Relations

ADMINISTRATION

Charles A. Caruson.....Director

Robert W. Rose, Minneapolis Public Schools.....Associate Director

David Feldman, Ph.D., University of Minnesota....Director of Research

Robert Bowman, Macalester College.....Audio-visual

Sandra M. Stepaniak.....Executive Secretary

Dorianne Evertz.....Secretary

Donnis Mohrbacher.....Secretary

Intern Teachers

Jeffrey Johnson

Thomas Gilsenan

Deborah Kidder

Jackie Jordan

Lon Rosenfield

1969 CONTRIBUTORS

Members of the Board of Directors

First National Bank of Saint Paul

Mr. Ken Glazer

Minneapolis Star and Tribune

Butler Foundation

Northwestern National Bank

Marquette National Bank

Dain, Kalman & Quail

Neilson Foundation

First National Bank of Minneapolis

Midland Bank

Brown & Bigelow

Mrs. Harry Bratnober

Mrs. Eunice Bauman

FINANCIAL STATEMENT for the year

ended September 30, 1969

The Finance Department of the Minneapolis Schools is responsible for receiving and disbursing all Title III money, State aid, and Board funds. The Institute maintains a separate budgetary control of only those funds that are derived from local contributions. It pays for those services that directly relate to the operation of the Institute and when necessary transfers funds to any deficit realized by the Minneapolis Schools.

RECEIPTS

Fund Balance 1968	$ 15,138.31
Federal Title III Funds	42,232.89
Minneapolis and Saint Paul Board of Education contributions and State aid	36,200.00
Local Contributions	18,385.00
Interest	555.02
Miscellaneous (sale of books, etc.)	1,181.13
Total Receipts	$ 113,692.35

DISBURSEMENTS

Administrative Salaries	$ 27,943.06
Teachers salaries	57,600.15

General Control

Printing	$ 174.49
Stationery, supplies, postage	587.82
Telephone	364.64
Contracted Services	139.25
Board Expense	216.32
Insurance and Legal	525.36
Custodial	42.00
Travel	469.90